

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 10, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in response thereto. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application.

The objection to the Drawings is respectfully traversed. The specification has been amended to correct for the informalities noted in the Office Action. Page 11 has been amended to reflect the connection of modulator 82 shown in Figure 5 and page 13 has been amended to include reference number 93 for the game port interface. Page 9 has been amended to correct the typographical error in the reference numbers of the TV adapters. Thus, the errors noted in the objection to the Drawings have been corrected and the objection should be withdrawn.

The objections to the specification are respectfully traversed. The Office Action suggests that "apparatus for" on page 2, line 29, should be "an apparatus for." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The word "apparatus" is being used by applicant in its plural sense. The statement being referred to summarizes the system of the invention. Rather than a single apparatus, at least two different devices are present -- namely a centralized gateway and a port extender. Therefore, the addition of a singular article would not be correct. Instead, the case of the verb "comprise" has been corrected.

The typographical error in the reference numbers for the TV adapters on page 9 has been corrected. Therefore, the objections to the specification should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-9, 12, and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass and further in view of Rakib is respectfully traversed. The invention is a replacement for a set-top box on every television monitor. Claim 1 recites apparatus for providing video content to a plurality of televisions located at a site comprising 1) a centralized gateway at a centralized gateway location within the site for connecting to the plurality of televisions and to a digital network supplying packet-based video content according to a plurality of selectable video feeds, and 2) a plurality of

port extender modules located separately from said centralized gateway, and each associated with a respective television. The centralized gateway has a plurality of decoders decompressing respective data streams and a plurality of television adapters generating television signals usable by a television in response to a selected uncompressed data stream. In order to allow a user to select desired content at a particular television, the port extenders associated with each television provides selection data to the processor in the centralized gateway via a local-area network interface. The particular structure of these devices and how their functionality is organized leads to the ability of the invention to overcome the deficiencies of the prior art. The combination of references relied on in the rejection fails to either teach or suggest the recited structure or functions and fails to achieve the advantages obtained by the invention.

Hylton is an example of the background prior art which requires a set-top box at each television. Each set-top unit includes digital audio/video processing and decoding, NTSC encoding, and RF modulation. Thus, the same high level of functionality is replicated at each television, resulting in a costly overall system. The use of full functionality in a device that is physically present at each television teaches away from the concepts of the present invention. Moreover, each set-top box must be directly connected with the respective television and directly controls only the video output to that television. The port extenders recited in claims 1-15 do not carry any audio or video signal and only interact with the television through the centralized gateway (even when the same wires are used to communicate between the gateway and the port extender and between the gateway and the television).

The addition of de Hass fails to strengthen the rejection because the teachings of de Hass would not lead one skilled in the art to make the modifications to Hylton as suggested in the Office Action. Complex video processing is required at each set-top box in Hylton because the signals received at each television are compressed digital signals. Furthermore, each set-top box only receives the video stream of interest for the respective television. Therefore, the combination of de Hass would not lead to any reduction in

bandwidth usage as claimed in the Office Action.

The addition of Rakib likewise fails to strengthen the rejection. Rakib merely stands for the known use of DHCP in a home gateway. The claims specifically recite port extenders which are units separately located from the centralized gateway and associated with a respective television for providing selection data obtained from a peripheral device operated by a user to select a video feed to the respective television. Since none of the cited references provide any teaching or suggestion of any device with the functionality of the port extenders, there is likewise no suggestion of IP addressing between the centralized gateway and the port extenders. Therefore, claims 1-9, 12, and 13 are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass in view of Rakib, and further in view of Humpleman is respectfully traversed. Humpleman fails to correct for the deficiencies noted above in the combination of Hylton, de Hass, and Rakib. Therefore, claim 10 is likewise allowable.

The rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass in view of Rakib, and further in view of Williams Jr. is respectfully traversed. Williams Jr. fails to correct for the deficiencies noted above in the combination of Hylton, de Hass, and Rakib. Therefore, claim 11 is likewise allowable.

The rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass and further in view of Rakib is respectfully traversed. Claims 14 and 15, as amended, contain limitations essentially the same as those discussed above in connection with claims 1-13. Therefore, claims 14 and 15 are likewise allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1-15 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Mark L. Mollon", written over a horizontal line.

Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: May 3, 2006
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)